

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-13 are pending, and have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Applicants believe the claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112. The specification and abstract have been amended to correct minor informalities.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ofek et al. (US 6,108,748) in view of Wilde (US 5,991,753). The Examiner recognizes that Ofek et al. does not disclose registering identification information about an unnecessary file to identify one or more unnecessary files and determining whether a file stored on the storage device is an unnecessary file, and cites Wilde for allegedly providing the missing teaching at column 14, lines 31-34.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 as amended is patentable over Ofek et al. and Wilde because, for instance, they do not teach or suggest an unnecessary file table having information between each of a plurality of migration source storage devices and none or at least one file corresponding to one of the migration source storage devices and not to be migrated to any one of a plurality of migration destination storage device; a necessary migration table having information between each of the plurality of migration destination storage devices and none or at least one file corresponding to one of the migration destination storage devices and needing to be migrated to at least one of the migration destination storage devices; and a computer checking all the files of one of the migration source storage devices to determine whether each of the files of the one migration source storage device is an unnecessary file which is not to be migrated to a migration destination storage device or an already migrated file which has been migrated to the at least one migration destination storage device.

Although Wilde discloses at column 14, lines 31-34 a lock list to specify files that should be excluded from migration, it does not provide an unnecessary file table and a necessary migration table as claimed. All the lock list contains is a list of files to be excluded from migration. It does not contain information between migration source storage devices and files to identify unnecessary files and information between migration destination storage devices and files to identify necessary files. Moreover, Wilde does not check all the files of

one of the migration source storage devices to determine whether each of the files of the one migration source storage device is an unnecessary file which is not to be migrated to a migration destination storage device or an already migrated file which has been migrated to the at least one migration destination storage device.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 and claims 2-5 depending therefrom are patentable over Ofek et al. and Wilde.

Claims 6-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ofek et al. (US 6,108,748) in view of Wilde (US 5,991,753) and Mogi et al. (US 2003/0093439). The Examiner recognizes that Ofek et al. and Wilde do not disclose displaying information to indicate that data migration is completed, and cites Mogi et al. for allegedly providing the missing teaching.

Mogi et al., however, does not cure the deficiencies of Ofek et al. and Wilde, in that it also fails to teach or suggest an unnecessary file table, a necessary migration table, and a computer checking all the files of one of the migration source storage devices to determine whether each of the files of the one migration source storage device is an unnecessary file which is not to be migrated to a migration destination storage device or an already migrated file which has been migrated to the at least one migration destination storage device, as recited in claim 1 from which claims 6-8 depend. For at least the foregoing reasons, dependent claims 6-8 are patentable.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 9 is patentable over Ofek et al., Wilde, and Mogi et al. because, for instance, they do not teach or suggest code for registering identification information to identify none or at least one unnecessary file in an unnecessary file table having information between each of a plurality of migration source storage devices and none or at least one file corresponding to one of the migration source storage devices and not to be migrated to a migration destination storage device; code for registering identification information to identify none or at least one necessary file in a necessary migration table having information between each of the plurality of migration destination storage devices and none or at least one file corresponding to one of the migration destination storage devices and needing to be migrated to at least one of the migration destination storage devices; and code for judging whether a file stored on the removable

storage device or the removable storage medium is an unnecessary file registered in the unnecessary file table or a necessary file registered in the necessary migration table.

As discussed above, although Wilde discloses at column 14, lines 31-34 a lock list to specify files that should be excluded from migration, it does not provide an unnecessary file table and a necessary migration table as claimed, and it does not check all the files of one of the migration source storage devices to determine whether each of the files of the one migration source storage device is an unnecessary file which is not to be migrated to a migration destination storage device or an already migrated file which has been migrated to the at least one migration destination storage device.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 9 and claims 10-11 depending therefrom are patentable over Ofek et al., Wilde, and Mogi et al.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 12 is patentable over Ofek et al., Wilde, and Mogi et al. because, for instance, they do not teach or suggest a processor that registers identification information with the memory to identify none or at least one registered unnecessary file in an unnecessary file table having information between each of a plurality of migration source storage devices and none or at least one file corresponding to one of the migration source storage devices and not to be migrated to a migration destination storage device, and registers identification information to identify none or at least one necessary file in a necessary migration table having information between each of the plurality of migration destination storage devices and none or at least one file corresponding to one of the migration destination storage devices and needing to be migrated to at least one of the migration destination storage devices; wherein the processor judges whether a file stored on the removable storage device or the removable storage medium is a registered unnecessary file, and if the file is not a registered unnecessary file, then judging whether the file is migrated to another storage device.

As discussed above, although Wilde discloses at column 14, lines 31-34 a lock list to specify files that should be excluded from migration, it does not provide an unnecessary file table and a necessary migration table as claimed, and it does not check all the files of one of the migration source storage devices to determine whether each of the files of the one migration source storage device is an unnecessary file which is not to be migrated

Appl. No.: 10/789,771
Amdt. dated: February 10, 2006
Reply to Office Action of: December 1, 2005

PATENT

to a migration destination storage device or an already migrated file which has been migrated to the at least one migration destination storage device.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 12 and claim 13 depending therefrom are patentable over Ofek et al., Wilde, and Mogi et al.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Chun-Pok Leung
Reg. No. 41,405

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
RL:rl
60699148 v1